A SERIOUS CONSIDERATION OF THE OATH OF THE Kings Supremacy:

Wherein these six Propositions are asserted.

1. *That some Swearing is Lawful.*
2. *That some promissory Oaths are Lawful.*
3. *That a promissory Oath of Allegiance and due obedience to a King is Lawful.*
4. *That the King in His Realm, is the onely Supreme Governour over all persons.*
5. *That the King is the Governour of the Realm, as well in all Spiritual or Ecclesiastical things, or causes, as temporal.*
6. *That the Jurisdictions, Priviledges, Preeminences, and Authorities in that Oath, may be assisted and defended.*

By *John Tombes* B. D.

Prov. 23. 21.

My son fear thou the LORD, *and the King: and meddle not with them that are given to change.*

LONDON,

Printed by *Henry Hills*, living in *Aldersgate-street* next door to the sign of the *Peacock*.

HARVARD COLLEGE
SEP. 11 1919

To the Christian Readers.

Hollis fund

BEing by special Providence brought hither upon some occasions of mine own, and finding many persons of different perswasions scrupling the taking of the oath of Supremacy now beginning to be urged, by reason of their unacquaintance with it through the long disuse of it; by various conferences I convinced sundry of them, that the end and matter of the oath was not such as they imagined: Whereupon some persons tender of the publique peace, and the liberties of those doubting persons, who still remained unsatisfied, earnestly presed me to draw up something in writing, tending to the elucidation of this doubt: which I was unwilling to do, being absent from mine own Books and Collections, and hoping to have staid here less time then I am now necessitated to do: yet the instant presure hath drawn from me this writing, though short and indigested, it being conceived useful in this juncture of time; wherein if I be offered on the sacrifice and service of your faith, I joy and rejoyce with you all, as being studious not how to have dominion over your faith, but to be a helper of your joy. For which end I crave your prayers, who am,

London Oct. 13. 1660.

Your brother and
servant in Christ,

John Tombes.

The OATH of SUPREMACY as it is in the Statute 1. *Eliz. Cap.* 1.

I A. B. do utterly teſtifie and declare in my conſcience, that the Queens Highneſs is the only ſupreme Governor of this Realm, and of all other her Highneſs Dominions and Countreys, as well in all Spiritual or Eccleſiaſtical things or Cauſes, as Temporal; and that no forreign Prince, Perſon, Prelate, State or Potentate hath, or ought to have any Juriſdiction, Power, Superiority, Preheminence, or Authority Eccleſiaſtical or Spiritual, within this Realm; and therefore I do utterly renounce and forſake all forreign Juriſdictions, Powers, Superiorities and Authorities, and do promiſe that from henceforth I ſhall bear Faith and true Allegiance to the Queens Highneſs, her Heirs and lawful Succeſſors, and to my power ſhall aſſiſt and defend all Juriſdictions, Priviledges, Preheminencies and Authorities, granted or belonging to the Queens Highneſs, her Heirs and Succeſſors, or united and annexed to the Imperial Crown of this Realm. So help me God, and by the Contents of this Book.

The Proviſo in the Statute of 5. Eliz. Cap. 1.

PRovided alſo, That the Oath expreſſed in the ſaid Act, made in the ſaid firſt year, ſhall be taken and expounded in ſuch form as is ſet forth in an Admonition annexed to the Queens Majeſties Injunctions, publiſhed in the firſt year of her Majeſties Reign; That is to ſay, to confeſs and acknowledge in her Majeſty, her Heirs and Succeſſors, none other Authority than that was challenged, and lately uſed by the noble King Henry the eighth, and King Edward the ſixth, as in the ſaid Admonition more plainly may appear.

The Admonition annexed to the Queens Injunctions.

THe Queens Majeſty being informed, that in certain places of this Realm, ſundry of her native Subjects, being called to Eccleſiaſtical miniſtery in the Church, be by ſiniſter perſwaſion, and perverſe conſtruction induced

to finde some scruple in the forme of an othe which by an Act of the last Parliament, is prescribed to be required of divers persons, for the recognition of their Allegiance to her Majesty, which certainly neither was ever ment, ne by any equity of words or good sence, can be thereof gathered: Would that all her loving Subjects should understand, that nothing was, is, or shall be ment or intended by the same othe, to have any other duty, allegiance, or bonde required by the same othe, then was acknowledged to be due to the most noble kynges of famous memory, kyng Henry the viii. Her Majesties father, or kyng Edward the sixth, Her Majesties brother.

And further Her Majesty forbyddeth all manner Her subjects to give ear or credit to suche perverse and malicioule persons, which most sinisterly and maliciously labour to notify to her loving subjects, how by the words of the sayde othe, it may be collected the kings or Queens of this Realm, possessours of the Crowne, may challenge authority and power of ministrie of divine offices in the Churche, wherein Her said subjectes be much abused by such evyl disposed persons. For certainly her Majesty neither doth: ne ever will challenge any other authority, than that was challenged and lately used by the sayde noble kinges of famous memorye, king Henry the eight, and kynge Edward the first, which is and was of ancient time due to the Imperial Crowne of this Realm. That is under God, to have the soveraintie and rule over all maner persons born within these Her Realms, Dominions, and Countries, of what estate, either ecclesiastical or temporal soever they be, so as no other forrain power shall or ought to have any superiorities over them. And if anye person that hath conceived anye other sence of the fourm of the sayde othe, shall accept the same othe with this interpretation, sence, or meaning, Her Majestie is well pleased to accept every such in that behalf, as her good and obedient subjects, and shall acquit them of all maner penalties conteyned in the said Act against such as shall peremptorily, or obstinately refuse to take the same othe.

The 37. Article profeſſed in the Church of England.

The Kings Majeſty hath the chief power in his Realm of England, and other his Dominions, unto whom the chief government of all Eſtates of this Realm, whether they be Eccleſiaſtical or Civil, in all Cauſes doth appertain, and is not, nor ought to be ſubject to any forrain juriſdiction: where we attribute to the Kings Majeſty the chief government, by which titles we underſtand the mindes of ſome ſlanderous folks to be offended, we give not to our Prince the miniſtring either of Gods Word, or of the Sacraments: the which thing, the Injunctions alſo, ſometime ſet forth by Elizabeth our (late) Queen, do moſt plainly teſtifie, but that onely Prerogative, which we ſee to have been given to all godly Princes in holy Scriptures by God himſelf, that is that they ſhould rule all eſtates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be Eccleſiaſtical or Temporal, and reſtrain with the civil ſword the ſtubborn, and evil doers.

The OATH of SUPREMACY briefly conſidered, and the lawfulneſs of taking it aſſerted.

IT is queſtioned, whether the Oath of the Kings being acknowledged Supreme Governour in all cauſes, according to the Statute 1. *Eliz.* may be lawfully taken? To which I anſwer affirmatively, and thus argue,

If it may not be lawfully taken, it is either becauſe no Oath may be taken, or no promiſſory Oath, or no promiſſory Oath to a King, or the matter of this Oath is not to be acknowledged or promiſed.

But none of theſe make it unlawful. *Ergo.*

The conſequence is proved, becauſe there is a ſufficient enumeration made of things that ſeem to prohibit the taking of it: if not, let what elſe may make it unlawful be named. The *minor* is proved by parts, in confirming theſe ſix propoſitions.

I. That ſome ſwearing is lawful.

II. That promiſſory Oaths may be lawful.

III. Tha-

III. That to ſwear to a King or Governour may be lawful.

IV. That the King is Supreme Governour over all perſons in his Dominions.

V. That he is Governour in Eccleſiaſtical cauſes.

VI. That the Iuriſdictions, Preeminences, and Priviledges meant in that Oath may be lawfully acknowledged and defended.

The firſt is proved thus.

I. That which is not *de toto genere*, in it's whole kind evil, may be lawful: But ſwearing is not *de toto genere*, or in its whole kind evil.

Therefore ſome ſwearing may be lawful.

The *major* is manifeſt of it ſelf. The *minor* is thus proved.

That is not wholly evil about the uſe of which ſome directions are given by God. God doth not give directions about the uſe of Blaſphemy, witchcraft, idolatry, *&c.* which are in their whole kind evil. But God giveth directions about the uſe of ſwearing, as in the third commandment (which is undoubtedly moral) *Jer.* 4. 2. where he ſaith, *And thou ſhalt ſwear, The Lord liveth, in truth, in judgement, and in righteouſneſs. Ergo.*

2. That which is approved by God, is lawful. But ſome ſwearing is approved by God. *Pſal.* 63. 11. *Every one that ſweareth by God ſhall glory. Ergo.*

The *major* is of it ſelf manifeſt, the *minor* the text evidenceth, ſith the ſwearing by God is made part of glorying in God, or of the ſwearers glory.

3. If it were unlawful to uſe any Oath, then it were unlawful to put any Oath on any. But this is not to be ſaid. *Ergo.*

The conſequence is manifeſt, ſith we cannot lawfully urge any to that which is of it ſelf ſinful: Now that it is lawful to put an Oath on ſome perſons at ſome times is manifeſt by Gods own appointment, *Levit.* 5. 1.4. his ratifying *Solomons* petition concerning this thing, 1 *King.* 8. 31. 2 *Chr.* 6. 22. and the practiſe of *Abraham* in the old Teſtament, *Gen.* 24. 2, 3. putting an Oath on his ſervant, and *Pauls* in the New, putting an Oath on the *Theſſalonians*, 1 *Theſ.* 5. 27. for ſo the Greek word tranſlated, *I charge you by the Lord*, or *adjure you*, as it is in the margin, *by the Lord*, is, I put the Lords Oath on you, or ſwear you *that this Epiſtle be read to all the holy brethren.* Alike charges are, 1 *Tim.* 6. 13. 2 *Tim.* 4. 1.

4. That which hath been the practiſe of the godly before, under the law, and in the times of the Goſpel without reproof is lawful, for in all theſe times, and by ſuch men moved as they were by Gods ſpirit,

ſe, even in their holy ſpeeches and writings, it would not have been done had it been ſinful.

But ſome ſwearing hath been the practiſe of the godly, before, under the law and in the times of the Goſpel, as is proved by inſtances, as of *Abraham* that *lift up his hand to the moſt high God*, *Gen.* 14. 22. of *Iſaac*, *Gen.* 26. 31. of *Jacob*, *Gen.* 31. 53. under the law, of the people of *Iſrael*, *Joſh.* 9. 19, 20. of *David* and *Jonathan*, 1 *Sam.* 20. 3. 42. *David* to *Saul*, 1 *Sam* 24 22. of *Uriiah*, 2 *Sam.* 11. 11. of *Ittai*, 2 *Sam.* 15. 21. of *David*, 1 *Kings* 1. 29, 30 & 2. 8. of *Solomon*, Verſ. 23. of *Elijah*, 1 *Kings* 17. 1. of *Michaiah*, 1 *Kings* 22. 14. of *Eliſha*, 2 *King.* 2. 4, 6. and 3. 14. and 5. 16. and the woman of *Shunem*, 2 *King.* 4. 30. in the times of the Goſpel, of *Paul*, 2 *Cor.* 1. 18. uſing this Oath, *As God is true*, verſe. 23. *I call God to record upon my ſoul*, and 11. 31. and 12. 19. 1 Cor. 15. 31. this is a form of ſwearing, *By your rejoycing which I have in Chriſt Jeſus*, it being in the Greek νὴ which is a particle of ſwearing, not διὰ or ἐν, which are prepoſitions noting the means or inſtrument of the effect; of the Angel, *Revel.* 10. 6. who *ſware by him that liveth for ever*. The like are *Rom.* 1. 9. & 9. 1. *Gal.* 1. 20. *Philip.* 1. 8. *Ergo.*

5 That which hath a neceſſary uſe for the benefit of humane ſociety, is not unlawful.

But ſome ſwearing hath a neceſſary uſe for the benefit of humane ſociety. *Ergo.*

The *major* is plain, it agreeing with the law of nature and nations, which is of neceſſary uſe for the benefit of humane ſociety, which laws God the author of nature hath imprinted in all, and indeed hath made all his laws for men one towards another ſubſervient thereto.

The *minor* is plain from the words of the Author to the Hebrews, *Chap.* 6. 16. An *Oath to men is an end of ſtrife*, which is a neceſſary uſe for humane benefit.

6. That which hath been counted by all nations as a Sacred thing, a principal part of the acknowledgement and worſhip of God, is not unlawful of it ſelf.

But ſo hath ſome ſwearing been counted. *Ergo.*

The *minor* is proved by Gods own words, *Deut.* 10. 20. *Thou ſhalt fear the LORD thy God, him ſhalt thou ſerve, and to him ſhalt thou cleave and ſwear by his name.*

The ſecond [*That promiſſory Oaths may be lawful*] is thus proved.

1. That is not altogether of it ſelf evil or unlawful, which God makes a bond of the ſoul to be kept and performed to the Lord.

But

But ſome promiſſory Oaths God makes a bond of the ſoul to be kept and performed to the Lord.

Ergo. Some promiſſory Othes may be lawful.

The *major* is proved, becauſe that which is altogether unlawful cannot bind the ſoul to God, nor is to be kept and performed to the Lord.

The *minor* is proved from *Numb.* 30. 2. *If a man vow a vow unto the Lord, or ſwear an Oath to bind his ſoul with a bond, he ſhall not break or profane his word, he ſhall do according to all that proceedeth out of his mouth.* Matth. 5. 33. *Again ye have heard that it hath been ſaid by them of old time, Thou ſhalt not forſwear thy ſelf, but ſhalt perform unto the Lord thine Oathes,* where a promiſſory Oath is made a bond to bind the ſoul with, to be kept and performed to the Lord.

2. If holy men afore the Law, under the Law, in Goſpel times have put promiſſory Oaths on others, then they are not altogether unlawful. This is proved by the ſame reaſon by which the like conſequence is proved before, in proving the fourth argument of the former propoſition.

But holy men afore the Law, as *Abraham, Gen.* 24. 2. 3. under the Law, as *Moſes, Deut.* 29. 14. *Jonathan,* 1 *Sam.* 20. 17. *Aſa* and the people of *Iſrael,* 2 *Chron.* 15. 12, 13, 14, 15. *Ezra, Ezra* 10. 5. in Goſpel times, *Paul,* 1 *Theſ.* 5. 27. adjuring the *Theſſalonians by the Lord, that that Epiſtle be read to all the holy brethren,* have put promiſſory Oaths on others. *Ergo.*

3. That which godly men have practiſed and ſtill counted as well done that is lawful.

But ſome promiſſory Oaths godly men have practiſed and ſtill counted as well done. *Ergo.*

The *major* is probable, and in this caſe, conſidering the perſons, and the holy Ghoſts recording as he hath done, certain.

The *minor* is proved by inſtances, of *David, Pſal.* 119. 106. *I have ſworn and will perform it, that I will keep thy righteous judgements.* 1 Sam. 20. 42. *And Jonathan ſaid to David, Go in peace, foraſmuch as we have ſworn both of us in the name of the Lord, ſaying, The Lord be between me and thee, and between my ſeed and thy ſeed for ever.* Nehem. 10. 29. *They clave to their brethren, their nobles, and entred into a curſe, and into an Oath to walk in Gods Law.* 1 King. 1. 29, 30. *And the king ſware and ſaid, As the Lord liveth, that hath redeemed my ſoul out of all diſtreſs, even as I ſware unto thee, that by the Lord God of Iſrael aſſuredly Solomon thy ſon ſhall reign after me, and he ſhall*

ſit

reproof is lawful, for in all theſe times, and by ſuch men moved as they were by Gods ſpirit, even in their holy ſpeeches and writings, it would not have been done, had it been ſinful.

But ſome ſwearing hath been the practiſe of the godly, before, under the law and in the times of the Goſpel, as is proved by inſtances, as of *Abraham* that *lift up his hand to the moſt high God*, *Gen.*14. 22. of *Iſaac*, *Gen.* 26. 31. of *Jacob*, *Gen.* 31. 53. under the law, of the people of *Iſrael*, *Joſh.* 9. 19. 20. of *David* and *Jonathan*, 1 *Sam.* 20. 3. 42. *David* to *Saul* 1 *Sam.* 24. 22. of *Urijah* 2 *Sam.* 11. 11. of *Ittai*, 2 *Sam.* 15. 21. of *David*, 1 *Kings* 1. 29, 30. & 2. 8. of *Solomon*, Verſ. 23. of *Elijah*, 1 *Kings* 17. 1. of *Michajah*, 1 *King.* 22. 14. of *Eliſha*, 2 *King.* 2. 4. 6. and 3. 14. and 5. 16. and the woman of *Shunem*, 2 *King.* 4. 30. in the times of the Goſpel, of *Paul*, 2 *Cor.* 1. 18. uſing this Oath, *As God is true*, verſ. 23. *I call God to record upon my ſoul*, and 11. 31. and 12. 19. 1 *Cor.* 15. 31. this is a form of ſwearing, *By your rejoycing which I have in Chriſt Jeſus*, it being in Greek νὴ which is a particle of ſwearing, not διὰ or ἐν, which are prepoſitions noting the means or inſtrument of the effect; of the Angel, *Revel.* 10. 6. who *ſware by him that liveth for ever.* The like are *Rom.* 1. 9. & 9. 1. *Gal.* 1. 20. *Philip.* 1. 8. *Ergo.*

5. That which hath a neceſſary uſe for the benefit of humane ſociety is not unlawful.

But ſome ſwearing hath a neceſſary uſe for the benefit of humane ſociety. *Ergo.*

The *major* is plain, it agreeing with the law of nature and nations, which is of neceſſary uſe for the benefit of humane ſociety, which lawes God the author of nature hath imprinted in all, and indeed hath made all his laws for men one towards another ſubſervient thereto.

The *minor* is plain from the words of the Author to the Hebrews *Chap.* 6. 16. An *Oath to men is an end of all ſtrife*,

 which

which is a neceſſary uſe for humane benefit.

6. That which hath been counted by all nations as a Sacred thing, a principal part of the acknowledgment and worſhip of God, is not unlawful of it ſelf.

But ſo hath ſome ſwearing been counted. *Ergo.*

The *minor* is proved by Gods own words, *Deut.* 10. 20. *Thou ſhalt fear the LORD thy God, him ſhalt thou ſerve, and to him ſhalt thou cleave, and ſwear by his name,*

The ſecond [*That promiſſory Oaths may be lawful*] is thus proved.

1. That is not altogether of it ſelf evil or unlawful, which God makes a bond of the ſoul to be kept and performed to the Lord.

But ſome promiſſory Oaths God makes a bond of the ſoul to be kept and performed to the Lord.

Ergo. Some promiſſory Oaths may be lawful.

The *major* is proved, becauſe that which is altogether unlawful cannot binde the ſoul to God, nor is to be kept and performed to the Lord.

The *minor* is proved from *Numb.* 30.2. *If a man vow a vow unto the Lord, or ſwear an Oath to binde his ſoul with a bond, he ſhall not break or profane his word, he ſhall do according to all that proceedeth out of his mouth,* Matth. 5. 33. *Again ye have heard what it hath been ſaid by them of old time, Thou ſhalt not forſwear thy ſelf, but ſhalt perform unto the Lord thine Oaths,* where a promiſſory Oath is made a bond to binde the ſoul with, to be kept and performed to the Lord.

2. If holy men afore the Law, under the Law, in Goſpel times have put promiſſory Oaths on others, then they are not altogether unlawful. This is proved by the ſame reaſon by which the like conſequence is proved before, in proving the fourth argument of the former propoſition.

But holy men afore the Law, as *Abraham, Gen.* 24. 2. 3. under the Law, as *Moſes, Deut.* 29. 14. *Jonathan,* 1 *Sam.* 20. 17. *Aſa* and the people of *Iſrael,* 2 *Chron.* 15. 12, 13, 14, 15.

Ezra,

Ezra, *Ezra* 10.5. in Goſpel times, *Paul*, 1 *Theſ.* 5. 27. adjuring the *Theſſalonians by the Lord, that that Epiſtle be read to all the holy brethren*, have put promiſſory Oaths on others. *Ergo.*

3 That which godly men have practiſed and ſtill counted as well done that is lawful.

But ſome promiſſory Oaths godly men have practiſed and ſtill counted as well done. *Ergo.*

The *major* is probable, and in this caſe, conſidering the perſons, and the holy Ghoſts recording as he hath done, certain.

The *minor* is proved by inſtances of *David*, *Pſal.* 119.106. *I have ſworn and will perform it, that I will keep thy righteous judgements*, 1 Sam.20.42. *And Jonathan ſaid to David, Go in peace, foraſmuch as we have ſworn both of us in the name of the Lord, ſaying, The Lord be between me and thee, and between my ſeed and thy ſeed for ever.* Nehem. 10. 29. *They clave to their brethren, their nobles, and entred into a curſe, and into an Oath to walk in Gods Law.* 1 King.1.29,30. *And the king ſware and ſaid, As the Lord liveth, that hath redeemed my ſoul out of all diſtreſs, even as I ſware unto thee that by the Lord God of Iſrael aſſuredly Solomon thy ſon ſhall reign after me, and he ſhall ſit upon my throne in my ſtead; even ſo will I certainly do this day.*

4. That which is made a qualification of one that ſhall dwell in Gods holy hill, is not unlawful: but *to ſwear to his hurt and not to change*, that is, to take a promiſſory Oath, and not to change, though it be to his dammage is made a qualification of one that ſhall dwell in Gods holy hill, *Pſal.* 15. 4.

Ergo. Some promiſſory Oaths are lawful.

The third Propoſition [*That to ſwear to a King or Governour is lawful*] is proved,

1. From approved examples, which prove either a duty, or at leaſt lawfulneſs of the thing.

That which hath been practiſed by holy men without reproof is lawful.

But ſwearing to Kings and Governours Allegiance and Obedience hath been practiſed by holy men. *Ergo.*

The *minor* is proved by inſtances of the people to *David*, 2 *Sam.*5.3. *So all the elders came to the king to Hebron, and king David made a league with them in Hebron before the Lord: and they anointed David king over Iſrael*, 1 Chron. 11.3. *Then came all the elders of Iſrael to the king to Hebron, and David made a covenant with them in Hebron before the Lord, and they anointed David king over Iſrael according to the word of the Lord by Samuel.* A Covenant before the Lord was an Oath, but the people of *Iſrael*, a holy people made a covenant before the Lord with *David* their king, therefore they entred into an Oath of Allegiance and due Obedience. The other is more plain, 2 *King.*11.4. *And in the ſeventh year Jehojada ſent and fet the rulers over hundreds with the captains and the guard, and brought them to him in the houſe of the Lord, and made a covenant with them, and took an Oath of them in the houſe of the Lord, and ſhewed them the kings ſon*, verſ. 17. *And Jehojada made a covenant between the Lord and the king, and the people, that they ſhould be the Lords people: between the king alſo and the people*, 2 Chron. 23.3. *And all the congregation made a covenant with the king in the houſe of God: and he ſaid unto them, Behold the kings ſon ſhall reign, as the Lord hath ſaid of the ſons of David*, verſ. 6. *Then Jehojada made a covenant between him and all the people, and between the king, that they ſhould be the Lords people.* Theſe are expreſs examples of ſwearing Allegiance to Kings, which is conſonant to what our Lord Chriſt teacheth, that we ſhould *render to Cæſar the things that are Cæſars, as to God the things that are Gods*, Matth. 22.21. Beſides we finde *David* ſwearing to *Saul*, 1 *Sam.* 24.22. the people conceiving themſelves bound by *Sauls* adjuration, 1 *Sam.* 14.24, 28. *Shimei* was bound by the Oath which

Solomon

Solomon impoſed on him, where *Solomon* ſpeaks thus to him, *Why haſt thou not kept the Oath of the Lord, and the commandment that I have charged thee with?* *Abrahams* ſervant ſware obedience to *Abraham*, and counted himſelf bound to keep it, *Gen.*24.2,3. Then aroſe *Ezra*, and made the *chief Prieſts, the Levites, and all Iſrael to ſwear, that they ſhould do according to this word, and they ſware*, Ezra 10. 5. *Nehemiah made them ſwear by God, ſaying, ye ſhall not give your daughters unto their ſons, nor take their daughters unto your ſons, or for your ſelves*, Nehem. 13.25.

2. From Gods dealing with *Zedekiah*, that kept not the Oath made to the King of *Babylon*, *Ezek.* 17. 18,19. where God doth not except againſt the Oath, but the breaking of it calling it *his Oath, which he had deſpiſed*, and *his covenant that he had broken*; whence I argue,

That which God calls his Oath, the deſpiſing of which he avengeth, may be lawfully taken.

But an Oath of ſubjection even to the King of *Babylon*, God calls his Oath, the deſpiſing of which he avengeth, therefore ſome Oath of ſubjection to a King, may be lawfull.

3. From the words of *Solomon*, *Eccleſ.*8.2. *I counſel thee to keep the kings commandment, and that in regard of the Oath of God. The Oath of God* ſeemeth to be an Oath by God to the king, being made the reaſon of keeping the kings commandment, as the Oath of *Shemei*, 1 *King.* 2.43. is termed *the Oath of the Lord*, *Zedechiah's* Oath to the King of *Babylon*, *Gods Oath and Covenant*, *Ezek.* 17. 19. *Prov.* 2. 17. the wives covenant with her husband, is called *the covenant of her God*; whence I argue,

That which is Gods Oath, and is urged as the reaſon of keeping the Kings command is lawful.

But an Oath of ſubjection to a King is Gods Oath, and urged as the reaſon of keeping his commandment, as the Text ſhews, therefore it is lawful. If by *the Oath of God* be

meant, not a particular Oath to a King, but the general Oath or Covenant to obey God (which ſeems not ſo likely, becauſe it is the ſpecial reaſon of keeping the Kings Commandment) yet thus alſo the argument holds: If it be lawful to make a general Oath to God of keeping his Laws, and this be one of Gods Laws to keep the Kings commandment, and that the particular Oath of ſubjection to the King is comprehended in the general Oath of keeping Gods commands, a particular Oath of obedience to the King is not unlawful.

4. That is lawful which is of neceſſary uſe for the Publique good.

But ſome ſwearing to a King or other Governors is of neceſſary uſe for the publique good, therefore it is lawful.

The *major* is confirmed in proving the *major* of the fifth argument of the firſt propoſition, The *minor* is proved by experience, even *Jehojada* and *David* conceived ſo, and the reaſon is, becauſe the common peace and good government cannot be kept but by good correſpondence between Prince and people: therefore if mutual Oaths tend thereto, as often they do, they are of neceſſary uſe for the publique good.

The grand objection is from the words of our Saviour, *Matth.*5.34,35,36,37. *But I ſay unto you, Swear not all, neither by heaven for it is Gods throne: nor by the earth, for it is his footſtool: neither by Jeruſalem, for it is the city of the great king. Neither ſhalt thou ſwear by thy head, becauſe thou canſt not make one hair white or black. But let your communication be yea, yea, nay, nay, for whatſoever is more then theſe cometh of evil:* and of the Apoſtles, *Jam.*5.12. *But above all things my brethren, ſwear not, neither by heaven, neither by the earth, neither by any other Oath: but let your yea be yea, and your nay, nay; leſt ye fall into condemnation:* which words do ſeem expreſly and fully to forbid any ſwearing at all, excluding ſome ſorts of Oaths by name, and the reſt by General

terms

terms, with preſcription that our *communication be yea, yea, nay, nay*, and determination, that *what is more then theſe cometh of evil, or the evil one*, which made ſome of the Ancients and later godly perſons conclude all Oaths of any ſort prohibited now to Chriſtians, though they were not to the Jews. But the reaſons foregiven are ſo cogent to the contrary, that we muſt of neceſſity finde out a limitation of the ſpeeches, as we do, and rightly, for the next words of our Saviour following, *verſ.*38,39,40,41,42. which are as full in ſhew for not reſiſting of evil, but offering our ſelves to receive further injury, and permitting more dammage and profuſe vain caſting away our eſtates, contrary to the law of nature, in our neceſſary defence, to that neceſſary moderate providence, which belongs to every man, that due reſpect which each is to have to the rules of mercy, bounty, and our own imployment and family, ſo that without good caution we ſhall make Chriſts precept in ſtead of being uſeful to become pernicious.

That we may then conſider how to underſtand our Lords precept about ſwearing, we are to take this as certain, that Chriſts precept forbids ſomewhat which the Phariſaical teachers allowed, though they forbad perjury; now one thing ſeems to be forbidden by our Lord Chriſt, to wit, the making of ſuch diſtinction of Oaths as the Phariſees did, and accordingly uſed them, which ſeems to have conſiſted in two things.

1. In conceiving they might uſe Oaths by ſome creatures, as if in ſuch uſe there were no relation to God, and ſo no profaning of his name, or taking it in vain. The reaſon of this ſeems to be Chriſts and *James* his inſtances onely in ſuch ſorts of Oaths as were by creatures, and the refutation of their conceit, by ſhewing, that all referred to God, as the Oath by the heaven, was by God, ſith it was his throne; by the earth, ſith it is his footſtool; by Jeruſalem, ſith it was his city; by the head ſith he makes the hair white or black.

2. That

2. That ſome of theſe Oaths made them debtors to perform what they ſware and not other, which appears from Chriſts own charge upon them, *Matth.*23. 16,17,18,19,20, 21,22. where he terms them *fools and blinde guides* for ſuch deciſion,concluding that all thoſe Oaths had reſpect to God, and did binde. And accordingly Chriſt is not to be underſtood as forbidding ſimply all Oaths, but ſuch differencing of Oaths in their meaning and obligation, as the Phariſees, and other Jews, either ſuperſtitiouſly or otherwiſe erroneouſly uſed, yet I do not conceive this is all. For the words, *Swear not at all, neither by heaven nor earth, nor any other Oath*, but preſcribing *yea, yea, nay, nay*, cenſuring more to be from evil, or the evil one, ſeems to forbid all Oaths in ſome caſes or manner, which ſome conceive as if he forbad a promiſſory Oath univerſally, or a vow with an Oath: But theſe opinions ſtand not with the ſecond Propoſition before proved, nor do I finde any thing in the text leading to them. And therefore I conceive,that the prohibition is of that frequent,vain,light,profane,unneceſſary, cuſtomary paſſionate ſwearing, or in ſecular matters of no importance, without any dread of an Oath, or conſideration of the holineſs of God, upon a provocation to anger, as *David*, 1 *Sam.* 25. 21. or deceifully as thoſe, *Pſal.* 24.4. all who take Gods name in vain, which I gather from the text.

1. In that he preſcribeth their *yea, yea, nay, nay*, to be in their *ſpeech* or *communication*, which ſeems to be meant of their familiar ſpeech one with another, in their anſwers to each other.

2. Becauſe *James* ſaying, *Let your yea be yea, and your nay nay*, doth exclude inconſtancy and lightneſs, and preſcribes ſuch conſiderateneſs as that they need not unſay what they have ſaid, that to uſe the Apoſtles ſpeech, 2 *Cor.* 1. 18. *Our words may not be yea, and nay*, off and on, but *yea and Amen*, that is, firm and ratified, ſo as that deeds anſwer to words, asbecomes men, that conſider what they ſay, and ſtill ſay the

that taught the good knowledge of the Lord, 2 Chron. 30. 1, 2, 5, 22. *Removed the high places, and brake the images, and cut down the groves, and brake in pieces the brazen ſerpent that Moſes had made: for unto thoſe days the children of Iſrael did burn incenſe to it*, 2 King. 18. 4. *Appointed the courſes of the Prieſts and Levites, with the portion to be given to the Prieſts and the Levites*, 2 Chron. 31. 2, 4. *Joſiah purged the land of Idols, repaired the Lords houſe, gathered all the people to hear the Law read, and to make them to ſtand to the covenant he made before the Lord, to walk after the Lord.* And in the doing of theſe things the Kings are ſaid to do that which was right in the eyes of the Lord, and to walk before the Lord with a perfect heart.

2. On the contrary, the not removing the high places, and permitting Idols, and neglecting the ſetting up of Gods true worſhip and ſervice, is charged upon ſome of the Kings as their ſin, 1 *King.* 15. 14. and 22. 43. 2 *King.* 14. 9. and 15. 4.

3. God gives a ſpecial charge to the King to *have a copy of the Law, and to read therein, that he may learn to fear the Lord, and to keep all the words of the Law, Deut.* 17. 18, 19. and therefore when *Jehojada* crowned King *Jehoaſh* he gave *him the teſtimony*, 2 *King.* 11. 12. that he might be minded, that he was, as a King, to know and to ſee to the keeping of the whole Law.

4. The open practice of Idolatry is imputed to the want *of a King in Iſrael*, *Judg.* 17. 5, 6. and 18. 1. which proves, that the King in *Iſrael* ought to reſtrain from Idolatry, and not to permit every man to do what was right in his own eyes.

The *major* is manifeſt, becauſe the Office of the Kings of *Iſrael* was no ceremonial function, as the Prieſts, but moral, and of perpetual uſe, and therefore belongs to other Kings as well as the Kings of *Iſrael*; nor doth the Goſpel deprive them, or any other of their State and Authority, by their becoming Chriſtians: for then ſuppoſe King *Agrippa* had become a Chriſtian, he muſt have ceaſed to be a King, and have had his Kingly power diminiſhed: but as the Apoſtle reſolves concerning ſervants and perſons of other conditions, 1 *Cor.* 7. 24. *Brethren, let every man wherein he is called therein abide with God*, that is, his Chriſtian calling doth not bind him to leave the ſtate and condition of life in which he was, nor diminiſh his Authority which he had when he was called to be a Chriſtian, as not conſiſting with Chriſtianity; ſo is it true concerning Kings and other Magiſtrates,

 they

they have greater obligation to God, and the Lord Christ, no less Authority and power as Kings by their Christianity: but they may abide in their Office, and exercise the lawful Authority they had before.

Perhaps it will be said, The Kings of *Israel* were types of Christ, and therefore their Power and Authority did cease in things Spiritual and Ecclesiastical, when Christ was come.

1. But to the contrary, this is said without proof, and so is rejected as easily as it is alledged.

2. It is true, Christ is often termed *David*, and it is said, *he shall sit on Davids throne*, *Luk.* 1. 32, 33. But this power of reforming Religion was not appropriate to *David*, or the race of the Kings of *Judah*, but belonged also to the Kings of *Israel*, (who were not types of Christ) who are charged with the permission or promoting of Idolatry, as their sin, as on *Jeroboam*, *Ahab*, &c. and *Jehu* is in some measure rewarded for the partial Reformation he made, 2 *King.* 10. 28, 29, 30. and therefore it belonged not to the Kings of *Israel* to reform Religion, onely as types of Christ, but even as Kings.

2. This is proved, and the Proposition it self. That is to be ascribed to the King, which was with approbation ascribed to Kings out of the Church.

But the Government in things and Causes spiritual or belonging to Religion, is ascribed with approbation to Kings out of the Church. *Ergo.*

The *major* is proved, because what of this kind is with approbation ascribed to Kings out of the Church, is to be taken as belonging to Kings as Kings, and not as typical Kings or Rulers.

The *minor* is proved by instances.

The first of *Cyrus* King of *Persia* of whom we read *that the Lord stirred up his spirit to make a Proclamation for building of Gods house*, 2 *Chron.* 36. 22, 23. *Ezra* 1. 1, 2. in doing this he is called *Gods shepherd*, *Isa* 44. 28. and *anointed* by God, *Isa.* 45. 1. and the same was continued by Decrees of *Darius*, *Ezra* 6. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12. and *Artaxerxes*, *Ezra* 7. 13, 21, 23, 26. now these things belonging to the building of Gods house, furthering his service, were spiritual things, and therefore Government in spiritual things belonging to Religion, is ascribed to Kings out of the Church.

To these may be added the Decree of *Nebuchadnezzar* against them that *should speak any thing amiss against the God of Shadrach*,

Meshach

Meshach and Abednego. Dan. 3. 29. and of *Darius, Dan.* 6. 26. *That in every Dominion of his Kingdom, men tremble and fear before the God of Daniel*, which are undoubtedly about spiritual Causes or Matters of Religion: and the King of *Nineveh his Proclamation by the Decree of the King and his nobles, that all should fast covered with sackcloth, and cry mightily to God, Jonah* 3. 7, 8. which is approved by God, in that he defer'd his judgement thereupon: in all which Government in matters of Religion was exercised and approved.

3. That which agrees to other Rulers besides Kings, agrees much more to Kings,

But to Govern in Causes spiritual or things of Religion, belongs to Governours below Kings, therefore much more to Kings.

4. The *major* is proved from the title given to the King, 1 *Pet.* 2. 13. where he is called the *Supreme* or *Excelling*, and of those that *are in Authority* or *Excelling*, 1 *Tim.* 2. 1, 2. the King is reckoned as chief; therefore if inferiour Governours are to Govern in matters of Religion, much more Kings. Now that they are to do so, appears by the practice of *Nehemiah*, who being not King, nor Priest, but Governour under the King of *Persia*, reformed the Priests, excluding aliens from the Priests chambers, giving the Levites their portion, and chiefly by restraining the profanation of the Sabbath, *Nehem.* 13. 9, 10, 15, 22. reckoning it among the works for which he would have God remember him. *Jacob* reforms his houshold by requiring them to put away the strange gods that were among them, and bury them, *Gen.* 35. 2, 4. Parents are required to bring up their children in *the nurture*, in Greek *discipline* or government and *admonition of the Lord, Ephes.* 5. 4. Servants *are to be obedient to their masters as to Christ*, Vers. 5. *As the servants of Christ doing the will of God from the heart*, Vers. 6. *With good will doing service as to the Lord and not to men*: therefore Parents and Masters have Government in matters of Religion, much more the Father and Master of the Common-wealth, having a more ample Authority.

4. This is further confirmed in that the Apostle where he speaks of the Powers, he saith without limitation, that *Rulers are not a terrour to good works but to evil: wilt thou not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same, he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doth evil, Rom.* 13. 3. 4. Kings and Governours sent by them are for *the punishment*

of evil doers, and *for the praise of them that do well*, without limitation and distinction of Civil and Spiritual things, 1 *Pet.* 2. 14. Now where the Law doth not distinguish, neither are we, and therefore are to understand the Governing in the text to be in Religious things as well as Civil.

5. Which is further confirmed from the Titles given to them: they are termed *gods*, *Psal.* 82. 1, 6. *John* 10. 34, 35. *Ministers of God*, Rom. 13. 4. *That judge not for man but for the Lord*, 2 *Chron.* 19. 9. therefore they are to be ministers in a Political way, and to judge in things of the Lord.

6. *Paul* did not refuse to apologize for himself about the accusations of the Jews against him for his profession and preaching of Christian Religion, but did justifie himself before *Felix*, *Festus* and king *Agrippa*, and appealed to *Cæsar*, *Act.* 23. 29. and 24. 5, 6, 8, 10. and 25. 8, 11, 19, 21, and 26. 2, 3. therefore he denied not, but acknowledged the Kings Government, even in the things and Causes that concern Christian Religion, and consequently we may in like manner acknowledge it.

7. *Paul* exhorts us to *pray* and *give thanks for Kings and all that are in authority* or *excellency*, *that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty*, 1 *Tim.* 2. 1, 2. therefore he supposeth that Kings have some Government in matters of godliness, as well as honesty, and therefore are Governours In Causes Spiritual, or of Religion.

8. From the absurdities which follow if this be not granted.

1. If the King be not Governour in Ecclesiastical things and Causes, then his Kingly power is of no use in matters of Religion, for if he have no Government in them he is to be a looker on, and in effect a meer cipher in respect of such things; But this is not to be said, sith matters of Religion do as much concern him to Govern in, as any causes, all experience shewing that no Government can be well ordered without some regard had to Religion.

2. All the actions which Kings have been commended for by godly persons were unjustifiable; the pulling down of Idols, restraining the importation and vending of Popes pardons, and consecrated ware, the causing the holy Bible to be translated, and publiquely to be read, proclaimnig fasts, and days of thanksgiving, with many of the like acts of Kingly Authority have been unwarrantable.

3. Kings should have no way of expressing their zeal for Gods worship.

worſhip and true Religion more then other men, if they were not Governours in ſpiritual things and Cauſes, nor be more accountable to God for neglect thereof, then other men, nor this ſin of theirs of more guilt then the like ſin of others, which are all abſurd.

4. All the holy Martyrs who have owned their authority, and ſubmitted to it when they ſuffered under it, all thoſe who have petitioned for Reformation of Religion to Kings, have given thanks to God for it, have adviſed that it ſhould be ſought from them, ſhould be cenſured as fooliſh, if not ſinfully countenancing an unrighteous uſurpation, and the beſt Chriſtian Kings who have done moſt for the ſettling the affairs of the Church cenſured ἀλλοτριεπισκοποι buſie in other mens matters, and the like is to be ſaid of Parliaments, and ſo all matters of Religion muſt be left wholly to Biſhops, the evil and miſerable effects of which are diſcernible in the Records of former and later times, to be intolerable; as it fell out in the troubles by *Thomas Becket* in the time of *Henry* the ſecond, of *Stephen Langton* in King *Johns* days, the perſecution in Queen *Maries* days by Biſhops, whoſe diſowning the Kings Supremacy and aſſerting the Popes, occaſioned the making and the impoſing of this Oath.

5. Thoſe Titles which have been given them for their care in ordering the things of the Church, that they were nurſing fathers and nurſing mothers to it, according to *Iſaiahs* prophecy, *Iſa.49. 29.* ſhould be recalled: all the exhortations and charges given to them by preachers to take care of the Church of God, ſhould be retracted, they ſhould be no longer minded, that they are to be keepers of both tables of the Law; in a word, it ſhould be their virtue to be as *Gallio* was, that *cared for none of theſe things*, *Acts* 18. 17. which are all abſurd.

Againſt this many things are objected.

1. That to acknowledge the King the onely Supreme Governour is to make him God.

To this I anſwer: Not ſo, ſith he is acknowledged Governour in his Dominions, and Supreme therein under God, and the excluſive term [*onely*] excludes foraign juriſdiction of the Pope and other Princes and States, (which by the Oath is renounced) not Gods Government.

Object. 2 If Kings are Governours in all cauſes, then they may appoint what Religion, and worſhip of God they pleaſe, and it is evil to diſobey or gainſay what they impoſe.

Answer. Though in temporal things they be Governours, yet are they to Govern according to Laws. So in Spiritual and Ecclesiastical things they are to Govern according to the Laws of Christ, and such rules as agree with them, and not in either, in a meerly arbitrary way after their own will: nor are we necessitated to obey or own what they require, if inconsistent with the laws of Christ, and such rules as agree with them.

Object. 3. If Kings be Governours in all Causes over all persons, then may they dissolve Churches and their Government, and mould and order them as they will.

Answ. So far as Church constitution, Government, and ordering is by Christs appointment, or such example which hath the force of an institution of Christ, it may not be altered by a King; But in such things as are left to humane prudence, and there is a concernment of the weal publique, Kings have authority to order them so, as that they tend to the real good and advantage of the Churches of Christ, and the glory of God, which is the highest and ultimate end of all.

Object. 4. This will make the use of Synods, and Assemblies of Pastors to determine things of Religion, and to order government unnecessary, sith the determination of all will lye in the Kings breast.

Answ. Though Statute-laws require the Kings assent, and the Government is to be exercised in his name, by his Commission, yet are not debates in Parliament, and passing bills by both Houses, nor consultations with judges, nor their decisions of cases unnecessary: The like is to be said of the use of Synods and Assemblies of Pastors and learned men, though the calling of them, and validity of their Canons, that is rules, in respect of the imposing them on others with civil penalties, require the Kings concurrence.

Object. 5. This hath occasioned great evils in so much that persecution hath been raised against godly persons as Heretiques and Schismatiques, when Princes have been misled; so as to burn, banish, imprison, and otherwise to afflict persons, judged by Prelates and others to be such.

Answ. 'Tis true this hath fallen out, when Princes ignorant of the true Religion, corrupted in their education, perverted by seducers and ungodly guides in their judgements have yielded too much to the misinformation of others, and so have been unhappy in the abuse of their Government to the great hurt in life, liberty, and estate of innocent persons: And the like hath been in mal-administration

ſtration of civil affairs, through the like cauſes: yet the power and authority in neither is to be denied for ſome abuſe: for that would introduce a worſe evil of Anarchy and miſchievous confuſions. On the other ſide when Princes have been good, and have uſed ſuch good Counſellours, as *Jehoiada* was to *Joaſh*; their Government in Religion hath been of great advantage to the Church of Chriſt. And, as things have ſtood in *England*, it was the means under God whereby Popery was expelled, and the Proteſtant Reformation was eſtabliſhed.

Object. 6. By allowing ſo much power in Eccleſiaſtical things, Religion is often changed with the King, and thereby peoples minds are at much uncertainty what Religion to be of, which tends to irreligion and Atheiſme.

Anſw. So it fell out in the Kingdom of *Judah*, yet the power of the Kings of *Judah* in matters of Religion was not for this cauſe denied. And the like happens upon change of teachers, as in the Churches of *Galatia*: and *Paul*, *Acts* 20. 29, 30. foretels the like would be in the Church of *Epheſus*, yet is not therefore the uſe and Government of Paſtors to be denied, but more diligence to be in uſing ſuch holy means as prayer for Kings, 1 *Tim.* 2. 1, 2. &c. which by Gods bleſſing may prevent theſe evils.

Object. 7. No man is to Govern in that whereof he is no fit Judge, nor is any man a fit Judge but he that is skilful in the things he judgeth: which ſeldom happened to Kings in matters of Religion, and therefore Government therein is ill aſcribed to them.

Anſ. As a King may be fit to Govern in Temporal Cauſes (whereto is required skill in the laws of the Land, of which perhaps he hath little or no knowledge, not ſo much as a Judge is to have, who paſſeth ſentence) if he chooſe and uſe them that are skilful and upright therein: ſo it may be in Eccleſiaſtical Cauſes, if he chooſe and uſe the help of them that are skilful and faithful in Religion. But in this thing there is need of the greateſt circumſpection, vigilancy and warineſs, on the one ſide by reaſon of the cunning and diligence of ſeducers, and the violence of ſpirit in profane perſons againſt the moſt holy and harmleſs Chriſtians, and on the other ſide by reaſon of the weakneſs in the faith of many upright ſouls, whoſe conſciences are very tender, and their wounds hardly cured: of whom our Lord Chriſt was very tender, *Matth.* 12. 20. and gentle toward them, as *the great Shepherd*

of

of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, Heb. 13. 20. as was foretold, *Isai.* 40. 11. and the Apostle *Paul* requires much indulgence to be given them, *Rom.* 14. 1, 4.

Object. 8. The acknowledgement of this Supremacy of the King hath been opposed by sundry godly Protestants, who have in their writings excepted against it, as *Calvin*, and the *Century* writers of *Magdeburg*.

Answ. Tis true, they excepted against the Title *of head of the Church* given to King *Henry* the eighth, as *Stephen Gardiner*, and such like persons misreported it, as if it gave to the King an uncontroilable authentique power, to determine of faith, and worship of God: but when those learned Protestants better understood what was meant by it, they withdrew their exceptions, as Doctor *Rainold* shews in his *Conference with Hart in the Tower*, chap. 10.

Object. 9. Many godly persons are offended with the taking, and defending the Lawfulness of the taking of this Oath, as fearing it many tend to the taking away those Liberties of their consciences in Religion, which are dearer to them then their lives: and being jealous of those who take it, least they betray those Liberties.

Ans. It is to be considered by those conscientious persons, who make this objection, that the takers, and defenders of the taking of this Oath do apprehend, that the imposing this Oath was for the excluding the Popes jurisdiction, and other Forreign power, as the admonition of Queen *Elizabeth* here prefixed shews, and therefore there is nothing done by such takers or defenders in prejudice of their brethrens Liberties, or imposition on the consciences of others: But they that have taken it, or conceive they may take it, if imposed, do it, as being satisfied in their consciences by the foregoing arguments, or such like, that they do but what they may do lawfully without offence, and hope that it will fall out as it did in the business of the Altar of *Ed, Josh.* 22. that a right intelligence of their fact will prevent any breach between them and others, and unite them more closely.

Object. 10. This acknowledgement of the Kings Supremacy in Causes Ecclesiastical hath been but of late, not before King *Henry* the eighth and *Edward* the sixth.

Answer. The Title of *head of the Church of England*, (now altered into Supreme Governour over all persons) though it were not assumed by the Kings of *England* before

fore *Henry* the eighth, yet the power of Supreme Government in Cauſes Eccleſiaſtical, as ſaith Biſhop *Bramhal* in his *anſwer to Militiere*, pag. 111. *The ancient Kings of England ever exerciſed, not onely before the Reformation, but before the* Norman *Conqueſt, as appeared by the Acts of their great Councils, by their Statutes, and Articles of the Clergy, by ſo many Laws of proviſion againſt the Biſhop of* Romes *conferring Eccleſiaſtical dignities and benefices upon Foreigners, by ſo many ſharp oppoſitions againſt the exactions and uſurpations of the Court of* Rome, *by ſo many Laws concerning the Patronage of Biſhopricks, and inveſtitures of Biſhops, by ſo many examples of Churchmen puniſhed by the Civil Magiſtrate. This power, though not this name, the Chriſtian Emperors of old aſſumed to themſelves, to Convocate Synods, to preſide in Synods, to confirm Synods, to eſtabliſh Eccleſiaſtical Laws, to receive appeals, to nominate Biſhops, to eject Biſhops, to ſuppreſs Hereſies, to Compoſe Eccleſiaſtical differences, in Councils, out of Councils, by themſelves, by their Delegates. All which is as clear in the Hiſtory of the Church, as if it were written with a beam of the Sun.*

The ſixth Propoſition is [*The Juriſdictions, Preeminences, Priviledges, and Authorities in that Oath may be aſſiſted and defended*] The juriſdictions, &c. meant I conceive to be expreſſed a little before the form of the Oath in the Statute of 1 *Eliz.* cap. 1. Of which the *Queens admonition* ſaith, *No other Authority is challenged, than that was challenged and lately uſed by King* Henry *the eighth, and* Edward *the ſixth, that is, under God, to have the Soveraignty and Rule over all manner of perſons, born within her Realms, Dominions and Countreys, of what eſtate either Eccleſiaſtical or Temporal ſoever they be, ſo as no other foreign power ſhall or ought to have any ſuperiority over them.* What was uſed in the days of *Henry* the eighth, and *Edward* the ſixth, appears by the book of *Acts and Monumens and Statutes* in their days.

to wit, the rejecting the Popes jurisdiction, appointing visitors, judging and deposing some Bishops, commands to take down Images, causing Divine service to be in the *English* tongue, the Bible in the *English* tongue to be in Churches, with many other things of the like kinde. The promise to defend them is [*to Our power*] whether by opposing the bringers in of a Forreign power, especially the Popes or by aiding the King in the right use of this Authority, neither is the power granted which may not be lawfully used or exercised, nor is the abuse of it required to be defended. With this explication, the Proposition is thus proved.

That we may lawfully swear to assist and defend, which may lawfully be exercised, and may be of necessary use.

This Proposition needs not any further proof being of it self manifest.

But all the Jurisdictions, Priviledges, Preeminences and Authorities meant in the Oath according to the Queens explication in her Admonition, ratified in the proviso of the Statute 5. *Eliz.* may be lawfully exercised, and may be of necessary use, as appears by the recital of them and their use before specified: therefore we may lawfully swear to assist and defend them.

The Objection that is made against this is, that these Jurisdictions, Preeminences, Priviledges, and Authorities were the same that were taken from the Pope and given to the King, and thereby Papal power was conferred on him.

To which I answer, *The power* (*saith* Hart *Conference with* Rainold, chap. 1. division 2.) *which we mean to the Pope by this title of the Supreme Head is, that the Government of the whole Church throughout the world doth depend of him: in him doth lie the power of judging and determining all causes of faith, of ruling Councils as President, and ratifying their Decrees; of ordering and confirming Bishops and Pastours; of deciding Causes brought him by Appeals from all the Coasts of the*

the earth, of reconciling any that are excommunicate, of excommunicating, ſuſpending or inflicting other cenſures and penalties on any that offend, yea, on Princes and Nations; finally of all things of the like ſort, for Governing of the Church, even whatſoever toucheth either preaching of Doctrine or practiſing of Diſcipline in the Church of Chriſt. Now this immenſe power, as too heavy for the ſhoulders of a mortal man, and as not belonging to the Kingly Office at all in many parts of it, is diſclaimed by the Kings of *England*, as is before ſhewed, and not meant to be acknowledged in the Oath. Therefore, ſaith Dr. *John Rainold Confer. with Hart*, chap. 10. *that which we take from the Pope we give not to any mortal creature*, and having by the reading of Dr. *Nowels reproof of Dormans proof* of *certain Articles* convinced *Hart* the Jeſuite, that no more is meant by it then what *Auguſt.* ſaith *Epiſt.* 50. *that Kings do ſerve God as Kings, if in their own Realm they command good things, and forbid evil, not onely concerning the civil ſtate of men, but the Religion of God alſo*: thus much he did ſubſcribe to. Out of all which I infer, that it was very preſumptuouſly and unjuſtly made by *Mounſier de la Militiere* the crime of the Kings of *England*, which God chaſtiſed by the late Tragedy, that *the Authority which God gave the King in Temporal matters was uſed by him for Governing Spiritual*, in his tempting Epiſtle to his Majeſty that now is, whom the Lord preſerve and direct in the mannaging of this power of ſo great concernment to ſo many millions of precious ſouls as are within his Dominions. *Amen.*

FINIS.